

Cabinet**17:30 – 19:20****15 March 2017**

Present: Councillors Waters (chair), Harris (vice chair), Bremner, Kendrick, Ryan, Stonard and Thomas (Va)

In Attendance: Councillor Schmierer

1. Apologies for absence

None.

2. Public questions/petitions

There was one public question from Mr Paul Scruton in reference to the Anglia Square policy guidance note:

“The public consultation on Anglia Square took place between 18 November and 9 January.

Responses were received from 28 individuals and organisations within the consultation period, comprising a total of 88 specific comments.

The owners and architects of Anglia Square hired a specialist company for public consultation events which were held in December 2016. In what were very successful public events, the *Norwich Over the Water* group - along with many members of the general public - submitted their views for consideration.

The council can surely not say that they were unaware of these consultations. If they are to be properly considered, then surely this item needs to be moved back to another cabinet meeting.

Is the city council now saying that our views and the views of the public will not be considered?”

A response was provided by Councillor Bremner, portfolio holder for Environment and sustainable development:

“The Council is well aware of the consultation that has been held around the emerging proposals for the redevelopment of Anglia Square. There have been two distinct consultations exercises one of which is still continuing.

The Council has consulted on the Policy Guidance Note for Anglia Square which is reported to this meeting for decision. The purpose of the Guidance Note is to guide emerging proposals for development on this important regeneration site by setting out relevant planning policy and broad principles for development of the

site and surrounding area. This will enable the Council to be clear on the policy framework and maximise clarity available to the developer in bringing forward proposals.

The Guidance Note has been developed alongside the developer's formulation of a detailed planning application which is still ongoing. This is in accordance with the requirements in the Council Statement of Community Involvement which requires developers to consult directly with the local community on developments of the scale of this one.

The developer's consultation process is still ongoing and is to inform the detailed design of the development to enable a planning application or applications to be submitted in the spring. An initial consultation took place in December and further events are planned in late March and early April. The consultation events which took place in December drew attention to the Council's ongoing consultation on the guidance note and invited people with comments to make on this to respond direct to the Council.

The council was fully aware of the developers planned consultation when it formulated the Guidance Note. The Sustainable Development Panel were informed on 7th November that there was a separate consultation by the developer on its emerging proposals which was likely to commence while the Guidance Note consultation was underway. The distinction between the two consultation exercises was reiterated in the Council's consultation material and on its webpage. This was clearly widely understood and the Council received a considerable number of comments on the draft Guidance Note many of which have influenced the content of the document reported to this meeting for approval.

As the developer's consultation is still ongoing they have not published the outcome of its consultation at this stage, although the comments made during stage 1 have been shared with Officers working on the developer on the emerging application. It is expected that the outcome of the developer's consultation exercise, will form part of the Report of Public Consultation which will be part of the documentation supporting a forthcoming planning application or applications. The Council has given due to consideration to representations it has received and will expect the developer to do likewise in formulating the detail of the proposals to be submitted.

Needless to say, any planning applications and supporting material will be subject to further consultation following submission. So there will still be further opportunity for people to comment if they feel their views have not been adequately responded to and there is no case to delay consideration of the Policy Guidance Note."

County Councillor Andrew Boswell then explained that he had submitted a public question via email. The committee officer said he had been unaware of this. Council officers left the room to investigate this.

3. Declarations of interest

There were three declarations of interest in item 10. These came from councillors Harris, Thomas and Stonard.

4. Minutes

RESOLVED to agree the accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2017.

5. Greater Norwich Local Plan - Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report

The portfolio holder for environment and sustainable development presented the report.

In response to a member's question, the head of planning services explained that the document under consideration was scoping report which existed to create a baseline from which further discussion could then be had.

RESOLVED to agree the Greater Norwich Local Plan Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report and its subsequent use as the basis for appraising policy options and choices in the Greater Norwich Local Plan.

At this point, the chief executive officer gave an apology to county councillor Andrew Boswell in relation to his public question. She explained that an administrative error had occurred meaning that the email containing his question had been overlooked. It was agreed that an answer would be provided in writing to county councillor Boswell and the opportunity would also exist for him to ask a supplementary question in relation to the response. (For question and response, see appendix 1 to these minutes).

6. Anglia Square Policy Guidance Note - KEY DECISION

The portfolio holder for environment and sustainable development presented the report.

In response to a member's question regarding a report in the Eastern Daily Press entitled *25-storey tower block planned in new Anglia Square development for up to 1,350 homes* the head of planning services explained that this represented the maximum parameters for any redevelopment and that obviously any proposals on the redevelopment would pass through the planning applications process giving the public and councillors ample opportunity to provide feedback.

RESOLVED to adopt the Anglia Square Policy Guidance Note as non-statutory guidance for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Anglia Square site.

7. Revenue budget monitoring 2016-17 - Period 10

The portfolio holder for resources and business liaison presented the report.

In response to a member's question, he explained that the potential for income being generated by the new Rose Lane car park had been reduced due to the older car

park next door to the site still being in operation. He did confirm however that this was for a fixed period of time and that once the ground level car park had closed, there was great confidence that revenues in the new multi-storey would increase.

RESOLVED to note the financial position as at 31 January 2017 and the forecast outturn 2016-17.

8. Quarter 3 2016 - 17 performance report

The leader of the council presented the report.

RESOLVED to note progress against the corporate plan priorities.

9. Pay Policy Statement 2017-18

The leader of the council presented the report.

In response to a member's question, the head of HR and learning explained that agency workers are paid in line with the councils grades and have the same employment rights and working conditions as those directly employed by the council - with the exception of employment terms outside of the agency worker regulations, which includes access to the Local government pension scheme.

RESOLVED to recommend to full council to approve the pay policy statement for 2017-18.

10. An overview of external relationships, contracts and grants 2017- 18 - KEY DECISION

The leader of the council presented the report.

In response to a member's question, the strategy manager confirmed that the issue of the living wage is covered within the conditions of grant awards to voluntary sector organisations. Those organisations who receive a grant from the city council are asked to confirm whether or not their employees engaged in delivering services for the council are paid the living wage.

RESOLVED to note the partnerships and business relationships and contracts registers, as well as the grants to be awarded for 2017-18.

11. Award of contracts for structural repairs to council homes – KEY DECISION

The portfolio holder for council housing presented the report.

RESOLVED to award the structural repair and improvement contracts for:

- a) Vale Green Phase 2 concrete repairs and deck membrane replacement to Acclaim Contracts Ltd.

- b) Portway Place and Hall Road – structural repairs to type MM blocks of flats to JB Specialist Refurbishments Ltd.
- c) Omnia Phase 5 Heartsease – concrete repairs and staircase and deck membrane replacement to Thomas Sinden Ltd.

12. Exclusion of the public

RESOLVED to exclude the public from the meeting during consideration items 13 to 13 (below) on the grounds contained in the relevant paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

13. Procurement of access control systems in housing flats – KEY DECISION

The portfolio holder for council housing presented the report.

In response to a member's question, the Head of Operational Property Management at Norwich Property Services explained that although careful prioritisation does take place when considering the replacement and installation of access control systems, it is very important to replace obsolete systems as a matter of priority.

RESOLVED to approve the award of the contract for the replacement and the installation of new access control systems in housing flats.

14. Purchase of new build housing for social rent - KEY DECISION

The portfolio holder for council housing presented the report.

RESOLVED:

- a) to recommend to council the establishment of a budget of up to £1million within the 2017/18 housing capital programme to be available when opportunities arise to purchase new build affordable homes, where this is affordable within the HRA 30 year business plan;
- b) Subject to council approval of the budget, that cabinet approve the acquisition of the first opportunity of this type

15. Neighbourhood model service review - KEY DECISION

The portfolio holder for council housing presented the report.

RESOLVED to approve the recommended option from the service options appraisal.

CHAIR

APPENDIX 1

Cabinet

15 March 2017

Public questions to cabinet members or chairs of committees

Public question to councillor Bert Bremner, cabinet member for environment and sustainable development from county councillor Andrew Boswell:

Will the Norwich City Council cabinet members who sit on the Greater Norwich Development Partnership (GNDP) Board request at the next GNDP meeting in March that GNDP make a commitment to bring in appropriate, numerical, measurable, non-legally binding, carbon foot printing, accounting and targets in the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report?

Councillor Bremner, cabinet member for environment and sustainable development's response:

Thank you for your question and the helpful background material you submitted to cabinet on 15 March 2017. I reiterate the apology given to you at the meeting for our mishandling of the question you submitted which meant you did not receive an answer at the meeting.

Obviously the question related to GNDP board meeting which took place on 23 March 2017. As you will doubtless be aware the GNDP did not consider any paper on the SA scoping report, although progress on the SA was reported as part of the update on the GNLP, and that neither of the two city council members at the meeting made the request you asked us to consider.

In process terms, the decision made by cabinet on 15 March 2017 to agree the SA scoping report was sufficient to agree its content and there was no further decision for the GNDP to make. Before making its decisions to agree the report, the council had, through the consultation and consideration at the Sustainable Development Panel, made a number of changes to the SA scoping report which were agreed by our partners.

In terms of the substance of your question and the issue of whether the SA scoping report should include carbon foot printing accounting and targets, I can add nothing to the response you received from the GNDP when you asked a related question on 23 March 2017 which I attach below for information:

Response from the GNLP team:

Thank you for your question, which re-iterates points made by councillor Boswell in response to the consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Scoping Report.

It is fully accepted that the Greater Norwich Local Plan (GNLP) should seek to address climate change and have policies to minimise the carbon footprint of the area. As agreed at the January 2017 GNLP meeting, the GNLP will include the objective “to mitigate against and adapt to climate change”.

The adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS) already does this. The main ways this is done are by promoting a sustainable distribution of development, the use of sustainable transport modes and other measures such as energy and water efficiency, the promotion of a green infrastructure network and flood risk mitigation. However, it is not necessary to establishing a specific numerical target for CO₂ emissions reduction to achieve this.

The SA Scoping Report, which has now been agreed by the councils following consultation, covers this issue in some detail. It includes climate change mitigation and adaptation as a theme. It also has an objective to adapt to and mitigate against climate change. Emerging GNLP policies will be tested through the SA against the criteria “Will it minimise CO₂ emissions?” The indicator of “CO₂ emissions per capita” will continue to be used, with the target “to reduce emissions”. The performance of reasonable alternative distributions of growth in terms of road transport emissions is also likely to be assessed as part of the SA. However, it is not considered that a full numerical carbon assessment, as promoted in the question, is reasonably required as part of the SA of the GNLP because:

- National carbon reduction targets take account of large scale projects to address climate change e.g. decarbonising energy production, promoting energy efficiency within homes and fuel efficiency in vehicles. It is difficult to see how carbon reduction targets could be established locally as the effects of such national measures could not readily be separated from the impacts of local policies. Therefore establishing an effective local target for what can be achieved through the planning system would be problematic;*
- The CO₂ emissions figures used to monitor the JCS and for the GNLP and its SA, are provided annually for local authority areas by Government. The figures cover transport, domestic and industrial/commercial emissions. The expense of establishing a monitoring regime locally and not using the national figures could be high and would be difficult to justify when high quality data is available for free;*
- Specific carbon reduction targets are not required by SA regulations and their use is not advised either by our specialist SA consultants Lepus or supported by the JCS Inspector who stated that such an approach could lead to “fictitious precision”.*

In summary, the SA Scoping Report does have appropriate targets for the overall reduction of per capita carbon emissions rather than establishing specific targets for that reduction so changes to the agreed approach are not proposed.